

Date: Wed, 24 Feb 93 04:30:28 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #48
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 24 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 48

Today's Topics:

 Eliminate the Written Exam (2 msgs)
 Question Pool Changes this summer?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1993 01:49:53 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu (Antonio Querubin) writes:

>In article <1142@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:
>>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, perry@hpfco.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott) writes:
>>>Nice sarcasm, Alan. Too bad it will be lost on a few.
>>
>>A few?

...
>What's the point? As with most poorly done sarcastic Usenet postings, the
>folks who usually catch the sarcasm are those who are familiar with previous
>posts of the sender or know him/her. With the lack of non-verbal cues to hint
>that the poster is attempting to be funny,

I wasn't trying to be either sarcastic or funny. I was hoping trying to
make the point that many of the same arguments that people use for
eliminating the CW exam hold equally well for the written exam.

I was disappointed that more people didn't tumble to that.

It might surprise some who are familiar with my earlier postings to learn that I would not be opposed to eliminating the CW exam ****IF**** the written exam could be beefed up to compensate. Unfortunately that is very unlikely to happen. Witness the Technician exam: when the code test was eliminated, there was no change to the written.

AL N1AL

Date: Mon, 22 Feb 93 23:05:16 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!n1mpq!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:

> Someone (Gary ke4zv?) said:
>
> It's all about interference, not laziness. Filters are a ham myth.
>
> I say:
>
> I agree on all your sentiments but this one.
>
> The ARRL certainly believes in the examination procedure as a filtering
> systems. How else can one explain the "incentive" licensing system and
> the multitude of license classes we have today? Filters are not a myth,
> but are a construct of a certain group of amateurs who exerted control
> over the hobby.
>
> Remember the FCC said they'd change the rules if a "sufficient" number
> of people wanted the rules changed. Half of the licensed hams today are
> novices and techs and the numbers are growing ...
>
> Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP
> a-kevinp@microsoft.com
> "We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Uh huh. And know why? Because of the damned no-code license. Reasoning like that really ticks me off.

I think the theory should stand AS IS. If we ever went to a no-code/no-theory license you might as well just buy an 11m rig because that's what 30MHz and above will be like.

Tony

```
-----  
-- Tony Pelliccio, N1MPQ/AA           // Why do some hams run 20mW      //  
-- god @ garlic.sbs.com              // into a stub-ducky in a car    //  
-----// and wonder why they can't  //  
-- And for those wondering:          // hit a repeater?              //  
-- Yes I AM flame retardent!         -----  
-- #include ASBESTOS_UNDERWEAR ON -- Soon a 2x2 call                  --  
-----
```

Date: 23 Feb 93 18:07:34 GMT
From: naucse!nauvax.ucc.nau.edu!cvm@arizona.edu
Subject: Question Pool Changes this summer?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have heard that the question pool is going to change this summer. Is this true?

My 9 year old daughter wants to get her license. We haven't decided whether to go the novice or no-code tech route. My plan is to have her study the novice written material and get her to pass the test. Then depending on how that went decide whether she should learn the code or take the tech written exam next. If she passes the novice test before the pool changes, will her certificate of completion still be good for one year? If not, I will not have her start studying until the new pool is out.

Chris Michels -- Systems Programmer cvm@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu
Northern Arizona University -- Flagstaff, AZ cvm@nauvax.bitnet
Phone: (602) 523-6495 N7YIU

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #48
